

Dear Ms. Sajac:

This is a request to be added to your e-mail and other lists for the Extended Review Forum for the California Water Plan Update 2003. Please also forward the letter below to Director Hannigan.

Thank you.

Felice Pace

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Mr. Hannigan:

In reviewing the composition of the Public Advisory Committee for the 2003 Water Plan Update I noticed that (with the exception of the Mono Lake Committee) all conservation representatives are from groups that are located/headquartered along the I-80 corridor. More importantly, all these groups deal primarily or exclusively with Central Valley water issues and/or Southern California Water issues. There is not one conservation member on the advisory committee who works on Klamath River Basin or North Coast water issues to any great extent.

This was perhaps understandable in the past since Southern and Central California issues, and especially CalFed, dominated state consciousness. However, that is yesterday's situation. Today, with water issues overheating on the Klamath and the North Coast (Eel River), California water managers need to see conservation interests more broadly and act accordingly. For this reason, we want to encourage you to use your discretion to adjust membership on the Advisory Committee so that Klamath River Basin and North Coast conservation interests are provided a voice. More comprehensive and balanced participation now would pay large dividends in the future in terms of support for planning and implementation of planned projects.

In reviewing the "Planning for the future of California Water" I studied the Water Flow Diagram. I

1/29/2003

want to urge more attention in the update to "total groundwater natural recharge." It has been pointed out that California's largest and most reliable reservoir are the forest soils in our uplands. Yet there remains misunderstanding at the highest levels concerning how forest and other upslope management affects water supplies. For example, the regional Council of Rural Counties has championed legislation (introduced last session by Mr. Dickerson) to use taxpayer funds to promote "thinning" of Sierra and other forests as a means to increase water yield. This issue was considered as part of Sierra Nevada National Forest planning. However, the public, high officials and decision makers remain confused or clearly wrong about how upland forest management affects water supply.

The 2003 update provides an opportunity to clarify the critical issue of upland forest management's impacts on water supplies and flow timing. I want to urge you to assure that this aspect of water planning is addressed in the 2003 update. Please advise us of how this issue will be integrated into the 2003 update and please share this issue with the Advisory Committee.

For an excellent summary of the science on the topic of forest management and water supplies/flow timing see "Thinning for increased water yield in the Sierra Nevada: Free lunch or pie in the sky?", Pacific Rivers Council, August 1998.

Thank you for considering these suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

Felice Pace

Felice Pace, Conservation Director  
P.O.Box 820 Etna, CA 96027  
530-467-5291 (voice) 530-467-3130 (fax)  
felicep@sisqtel.net

"Nowhere in America is there a better opportunity to restore an entire river system."  
-- Tim Palmer, author of "Wild & Scenic Rivers of America," on the Klamath River.

Check Out Our Home Page:  
<http://www.Klamathforestalliance.org>